## **SENATE, No. 1491**

# **STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

### 212th LEGISLATURE

INTRODUCED MARCH 2, 2006

**Sponsored by:** 

Senator JOHN H. ADLER

District 6 (Camden)

Senator THOMAS H. KEAN, JR.

**District 21 (Essex, Morris, Somerset and Union)** 

**Co-Sponsored by:** 

**Senator Bucco** 

#### **SYNOPSIS**

Authorizes bars and restaurants to offer special discounts based on sex under certain circumstances.

#### **CURRENT VERSION OF TEXT**

As introduced.

(Sponsorship Updated As Of: 3/14/2006)

#### S1491 ADLER, T. KEAN

1	AN ACT	concerning	the	"Law	Against	Discrimination"	and
2	supplementing P.L.1945, c.169.						

**BE IT ENACTED** by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the "Law Against Discrimination," P.L.1945, c.169 (C.10:5-1 et seq.), to the contrary, the holder of a plenary retail consumption license issued pursuant to R.S.33:1-12 may charge de minimis differential pricing for alcoholic beverages and offer other special discounts to patrons based on sex, provided that such pricing is for economic reasons only.

2. This act shall take effect immediately.

#### **STATEMENT**

This bill provides that the holder of a plenary retail consumption license issued pursuant to R.S.33:1-12 may charge de minimis differential pricing for alcoholic beverages and offer other special discounts to patrons based on sex, provided that such pricing is for economic reasons only.

This is in response to the June 1, 2004 ruling by the Division on Civil Rights declaring "Ladies' Night" at a Cherry Hill restaurant, the Coastline, discriminatory against men. See <u>David R. Gillespie v. J.C.B.C.</u>, Inc. d/b/a Coastline Restaurant, Division on Civil Rights, OAL Docket No. CRT 2579-03 (June 1, 2004).

In the case, the Division on Civil Rights held that the regularly scheduled "Ladies' Night" promotions at the Cherry Hill restaurant violated the LAD as an impermissible differential treatment based on gender. During "Ladies' Night" at the restaurant, women received free admission and discounted drinks, while men had to pay the regular \$5.00 admission fee and pay full price for drinks. The Division made its ruling, despite the fact that the restaurant offered similar discounts offered only to men on other nights, opining that the restaurant's "policy of discriminating against men can in no way be justified by subsequent discriminatory acts that disfavor women." Id.